



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/659,706

09/11/2003

Simon L. McGurk

029318-0968

4753

31049

7590

07/28/2008

Elan Drug Delivery, Inc. c/o Foley & Lardner
3000 K Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20007-5109

EXAMINER

SILVERMAN, ERIC E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1618

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/659,706</p>	<p>Applicant(s) MCGURK ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner Eric E. Silverman</p>	<p>Art Unit 1618</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 01 July 0708 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See continuation sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Michael G. Hartley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618

Continuation of 11, above:1) In response to Applicants' arguments that the finality of the last rejection should be withdrawn, Applicants' arguments are predicated on the idea that the references used in the previous rejection were already of record, and that the rejection applied in the final office action could have been applied earlier. In response, it is noted that the amendment filed 1/22/2008, which precipitated the final office action, introduced limitations into the claims that had not previously been considered. For example, the amendment to claim 1 required, for the first time, that at least one surface stabilizer be adsorbed on the surface of the particles. This amendment overcame the rejections in the non-final action but necessitated new rejections. That the new rejections were based on art already of record is of no moment; indeed, as the art was on record, Applicants' might have foreseen that these new rejections would be required before filing the amendment on 1/22/2008. The finality of the previous office action is still deemed appropriate. (2) In response to Applicants' request for reconsideration, all of Applicants' arguments are based on the faulty premise that the "soft gelatin shell" of the EP reference does not equate to the gel-matrix of claim 1. Applicant points out that while the EP reference requires a polyalkylene glycol having a molecular weight of 600 or less, this is not required by instant claim 8. While it is unclear how the limitations of instant claim 8 reflect the patentability of instant claim 1, it is noted that none of the claims have limitations that would exclude the polyalkylene glycol of the EP reference. Next, Applicants' attempt to draw a distinction between the instant gel matrix which contains from "about 20% to about 97% water" with the EP reference's teaching of minimizing the amount of water, which according to EP means the inclusion of "about 5 to about 25% water". This argument fails because the prior art range substantially overlaps with that of the claims, thus rendering the claim obvious. The above argument notwithstanding, the instant claims do not actually require the presence of any water, and so the amount of water cannot distinguish over the art. To wit, claim 1 merely requires that the gel forming substance is "exhibits gelation sufficient to retain water in an amount of from about 20% to about 97%." This limitation does not require that said water actually be present, merely that it could be present based on the degree of gelation.